CALFED Water Quality
November 20, 1996 Meeting
Flip-Chart Notes

1. It is not immediately apparent why Actions 19, 20, 21 ranked high for agriculture. Opinion with respect to water quality in general.

2. Problems corresponding hand-outs with overheads.
   - Shading problems incorrect.
   - Parameters do not match hand-outs.

3. Mine drainage universally high but only addresses toxic elements. It is a contention that reducing toxic elements is most important.

4. Something that is very important might be passed up in screening process.

5. Maybe rewrite enforcement of existing agricultural source control to more enforcement of agricultural source ? control (eliminate).

6. **Action 10** - Anytime you reduce tailwater you increase the concentration of constituents in drainage water depending on constituents. Surface water and drainage water should be addressed in separate actions.

7. **Action 13** - Reducing pesticide and microbial agents by following land would take excessive amounts of land and be economically unfeasible. This action should be directed at last sentence "selenium". CVRWQCB says that this would be more in keeping with the Basin Plan. Reductions in other constituents would be a fringe benefit.

8. **Action 32** - Should apply to urban and agriculture. IPM needs to be defined - it has been done for 20 years. Should suggest for urban sector, too (response - is it feasible - multiple landowners). BMPs, less use (when possible) etc.

9. Form & Process Comment - Perspective to take on actions - short or long term potential for what? (in ranking). Needs to be addressed when approaching actions.

Action Clarification

Action 1
- What does costly and severe drainage problems mean? - Bill J
- Periods of low flow may not be important. - Bill J
- Economic issues and feasibility needs to be considered. - Ted R
- Timing of discharge and source control are two separate issues. - Nigel
- Should it just be San Joaquin or a broader regional perspective? - Lance

Action 11
- Separate surface versus tailwater issues CVRWQCB (surface and sub-surface drainage).
- Introduce load concept in place of water use efficiency. - Nigel
- Loads for salts - concentration for pesticides. - Chris Foe
- Regional segregation. - Lance
- Make sure compliant with definition of Clean Water Act. - Bob Herkert

Action 13
- This action mixes too many issues - drought, productivity, compensation - does not necessarily relate to actions.
- Retain last sentence only. Others not relevant.

Action 19
Incentives for Source Control
- Combine Actions 18 and 19.
- Combine Actions 10 and 11.

Action 20
- What does better planning mean?
- What would be the vehicle that CALFED would use to do this?

Action 21
- What does it mean?
- Emphasize word "coordination".
- Add "future" watershed program.
- Add "and other efforts".

Action 22
- Does not address abandoned mines.
- Why name specific sites?
- Leviathon Mine is not in the watershed.

Action 23
- Does not go far enough - dumping of fuel waste should be an issue too.
- Wording does not say "incentives" but should.
- Intention was to reduce fuel discharges not human waste.
- Should this include restricting boats to certain areas of the Delta?
- Pathogens of concern to urban drinking water supplies.

Action 31
- Add "and implement control strategies".
- Can do this action and still not get answers.
- Feasibility is being challenged.
- Diazinon and chlorpyrifos is being tested by CVRWQCB.
- Need to figure out how to address.

- Does not fit with other actions - apples versus oranges.
- Needs to have reasons (or program) for testing.
- Biological problems need to be defined.
- Important research element but do not think it meets solution principles.

Action 32
- Replace "farmers" with "people".
- Developing IPM is expensive and may not be an opportunity.

Development of Actions - Comments on List

1. How will we do it? What will product look like?

2. None will be thrown out.

3. Need an action to provide education/technical support.

4. Addresses economical and urban water quality concerns more extensively than agriculture (e.g., toxicity testing ranked low).

5. Redo prioritization of actions.

6. Clarify selection criteria for prioritizing actions.
   - Technical
   - Social
   - Environmental
   - Economic

   Score based on each action.

7. Do not know enough to perform technical evaluation of actions.

8. Omits removal of drainage from San Jaoquin Valley for political reasons.

9. Suggest that we work with existing list.

10. Flesh out actions in more detail. Ranking currently depends on assumptions made by evaluations. Clarify goals.

11. Burden on those who recognize deficiencies. Proceed with current list.

12. Final actions list must achieve program objectives, or expand.

13. Are we narrowing list now?

Following Carol's presentation, Rick opened the floor to a general discussion. Following are general audience comments and suggestions.

General ~~Audience~~ Comments and Suggestions

1. Outline a process that describes where the water quality team is going and where it is now.

2. Define/Clarify the objectives of the water quality team. Add FC 3,

3. Define criteria that will be used to prioritize actions. For example,
   Technical
   Environmental
   Social
   Economic

4. Refine all actions based on comments and selection criteria, then prioritize them.

5. Explain what will be done with the actions once they are refined.

6. Make sure only actions that meet the objectives of the water quality team are included in the top ten list.

7. Develop an action to provide educational and technical information to mining and agricultural groups.

8. Outline a formal process to involve environmental groups in the CALFED water quality team process.

The meeting ended with Rick Woodard briefly describing the analytical plan for action analysis. Rick mentioned that it was in the hand-out packet and asked committee members to review it and return comments ~~by November~~ 27, 1996. Work to be done by the water quality group before the next meeting was agreed upon. Agreements follow.

Agreements

1. The top ten actions will stay the same.

2. The top ten actions will be refined, clarified and provided to the water quality committee members ~~by Wednesday, November 27~~. as soon as possible,

3. Water quality ~~committee~~ technical group members will provide feedback on the analytical plan and parameters of concern to Rick Woodard (CALFED) by Wednesday, November 27. 14 pt, Bold font

4. Water quality committee member feedback on the reference list and numeric ~~objectives~~ targets is needed by the next water quality committee meeting on December 9.

D-032967

D-032967

Proposed Work Plan

1. Clarify each of the 32 actions (group input).

2. Commence data development for the current list of 10 actions.

3. Group feedback on work plan and WQ parameters by Wednesday, November 27.

4. Clarify list by early December. Group feedback on December 9 or earlier.

5. How to deal with lack of participation by environmental groups in this process?
   - Response: Environmental groups are concentrating their resources on other CALFED activities. They have been invited to these meetings.

Parameter Ranges

1. Add tributaries in the upper Sacramento River to the area of focus.

2. The 56°F objective at Hamilton City is unachievable - "shall not exceed" wording.

3. Objectives can evolve into standards - CALFED should be careful.

4. Does CALFED need to be quantitative about criteria? Could narrative criteria be used.

5. How will we model pollutants? Adequate tools do not exist.

6. Did we consider narrative objects - yes. Need to recover.

7. SJR - Unspecified = throughout river.

8. Salinity and SAR conflict (agriculture).

9. Check release of water to attain temperature objective at Vernalis is not beneficial use.

10. Can you elaborate on using narrative versus numerical objectives?